DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 522 CS 504 336

AUTHOR Bybee, Carl R.; Cahn, Dudley D.
TITLE Communication Policy and Theory: Current Perspectives on Mass Communication Research.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Dallas, TX, May 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; *Cultural Differences; *Information Dissemination; *Mass Media Effects; Media Research; *Models; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; Social Networks; Socioeconomic Influences; Telecommunications

ABSTRACT

The integration of American and European mass communication research models would provide a broader sociocultural framework for formulating communication policy. Emphasizing a functional approach, the American diffusionist model assumes that society is a system of interrelated parts naturally tending toward a state of dynamic equilibrium. The European model, however, postulates a society not in equilibrium but in constant flux owing to conflict among competing interest groups. Consequently, while American research tends to focus on mass media's effect on the individual and general role in the socialization process, European studies concentrate on the distribution of control over telecommunications. To integrate these two models, a theory must consider both individual actions and socioeconomic forces affected by and affecting the mass media, and must reconcile views of society in conflict and in equilibrium. Possible effects of this fusion for mass communication study and policymaking include (1) new understanding of the mass media's close relationship with the entire social system, (2) expansion of the scope of research to include social as well as psychological implications, and (3) greater consideration of cultural differences in policy decisions. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235522

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COMMUNICATION POLICY AND THEORY:

CURRENT PERSPECTIVES ON MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

by

Carl R. Bybee
Communication Research Center
Department of Speech
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Dudley D. Cahn
Department of Communication
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Honolulu, Hawaii

Paper presented to the Mass Communication Division of the International Communication Association, Dallas, Texas, May 1983.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carl R. Bybee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504336

COMMUNICATION POLICY AND THEORY:

CURRENT PERSPECTIVES ON MASS COMUNICATION RESEARCH

Since development from an agrarian to an industrial nation and continued planning in developed countries depend on a formulation of objectives, it is clear that communication policy formulation is a prerequisite for controlled growth and effective planning. Presently, many mass media scholars are interested in the subject of communication policy, which essentially refers to the norms and standards usually set by a government to regulate the use of communication goods and services, particularly the mass media and telecommunications. It is infrequently observed that communication policy rests on a research paradigm that consists of a set of assumptions about the nature and process of communication (21). In fact, policy research is usually distinguished from theory--oriented communication research.

We take the position that communication policy must be consistent with working theoretical perspectives on the nature and process of communication. During the conduct of empirical research, a paradigm may or may not prove fruitful. The failure of a paradigm to generate useful research generally results in its abandonment by scholars in search of an alternative paradigm that will prove more useful. In the "best of all possible worlds" a shift in thinking about human communication would be followed by a corresponding shift in communication policy. In taking this position, we argue for a shift from the traditional research paradigm to a new one. While others argue similarly (7,19), we propose as an alternative an integrated American-European model, and by way of implication, suggest that the shift in paradigms requires a corresponding change from a diffusionist approach to a broader sociocultural approach to the formulation of communication policy.

For the last twenty years many scholars have viewed the field of mass communication as primarily the empirical study of mass media effects. Traditionally the study of the potential influence of mass communication has focused on the effects of messages on individual's attitudes and behavior. While this is an important question that deserves careful attention, it creates a distorted view of the role of mass communication in society, somewhat akin to beginning a study of the social consequences of introducing the automobile into American society with a minute examination of the potential effects of gas pedals on aggressive behavior. While historical, theoretical perspectives exist which call for a broader approach to the study of mass communication, these have tended to be ignored until recently.

When we take a more serious look at the way mass communication effects literature, we are immediately confronted with the area's essential proposition: the mass media have no effects or at best, minimal or reinforcing effects (2,10). The primary task of the area appears to be the execution of an exacting post-mortem, that is, asking the question "why are there no effects?" or somewhat more optimistically, "Are there special circumstances under which effects are at least possible?" These are not exactly thrilling questions capable of exciting intellectual enthusiasm or curiosity, especially when contrasted to our knowledge of history and our personal experiences. The mass media have been charged and credited with getting the United States into war and out of war, bringing American presidents to their knees, crushing the political ambitions of the well-known and catapulting unknown personalities into positions of great power, stimulating airplane hijackings, murder, mass violence, and frantic buying binges of fashion designer jeans. Obviously the advertising and public

relations industries believe that the mass media have significant informational and motivational capabilities (1). Tehranian (22) credits mass communication along with mass education and mass consumption as the tertiary carriers in the process of modernization. We are surrounded by evidence of the growing presence of the mass media in our personal lives and our social institutions. Equally important, but somewhat less obvious, observations can be made by the astute student of mass communication regarding the increasing concentration, centralization and nationalization of the mass media industries. To cling to the proposition that the mass media have no effects on our lives is clearly unreasonable.

History reveals that communication research, or at least the standard historical accounting of communication research, had too narrow a focus with little regard for societal context. At least three important historical forces in the early 1900's set the stage for the study of media effects. First, there was a concern that the psychological isolation of individuals in an industrial society would make them extremely susceptible to influence from the easily accessible mass medium radio. In addition, the need to unify national support through propaganda (11) for the war effort and the commercialization of radio (Radio Act of 1927) came to fix the attention of American mass communication researchers on the short-term effects of the mass media. This stimulus-response view of mass media effects came to be known as the hypodermic needle model, a simplistic explanation that served as the reference point for much mass communication research over the next forty years.

Almost all subsequent models of mass media effects are either conceptual elaborations of the meanings of the mass media stimuli and the mass media effects of this simplistic model or studies of intervening variables between the stimuli and the effects (9). Furthermore, the hypodermic needle model is also responsible for some enduring propositions about mass communication.

The enduring propositions were largely responsible for establishing the implicit parameters for future research. The focus on effects meant that mass communication would primarily be studied as a causal force, a stimuli capable of exerting influence rather than as an outcome of social forces. It also meant that the process by which the influence was exerted would be an issue of great concern. Since it was the influence of the mass media or individuals that was of primary concern, a perspective heavily weighted toward psychology was brought to bear on the study of process. Finally, the lack of potential feedback from the audience to the mass communicators was accepted as a given of the mass communication process rather than as a researchable issue with potential societal consequences. In total, these implicit propositions resulted in the study of mass communication as a within institution process, that is, as a system of influence operating independently from the larger social and political system.

A more obvious set of propositions embedded in this original model of mass media effects provided the conceptual targets for a half-century of challenge and debate. First, the mass media were assumed to have significant social psychological effects. With the rise in the early 1920's and 30's of an empirical orientation toward the social sciences, this assumption was soon tested. However, the early model's implicit definition of a mass media effect as primarily attitude change remained virtually unchallenged until the late 1950's when it was becoming clear that such a narrow focus of media effects was quickly leading to a dead-end for the field. The preoccupation of empirical researchers in the field with the idea that short-term as opposed to long-term influences of the media should be the primary focus has also proven to be fairly resistant to serious challenge until quite recently.

Other propositions that were mainly responsible for stimulating early research were that the influence of the mass media on individuals is fairly direct, that the audience is passively waiting to receive mass communication messages, and that the audience for these messages is primarily composed of atomized, socially disconnected individuals. As each of these propositions was empirically challenged, the stimulus-response model of mass communication began to take on a much more complex form (9). However, even in its most complex form, the stimulus-response model could not provide a framework for understanding the societal functions of the media. Consequently American mass media scholars turned to the dominant social theoretical area of the time for conceptual reference: functionalism.

It should be noted that it was a special brand of functionalism more identified with the work of Robert Merton than Talcott Parsons. Although these two men were the major representatives of functionalism in sociology, they held substantially different views of the functional approach. Merton essentially articulated a methodological approach for the study of social systems. Parsons developed a sophisticated explanation for why social systems assume a particular form. The greater influence of Merton's work as contrasted to Parsons' work seems to have at least two roots. The first is that Merton's position at Columbia University put him in close contact with several scholars, such as Paul Lazarsfeld, who were devoting their primary energy to the study of mass communication. The fact that Lazarsfeld's early work in the field was soon elevated to the status of "classic" solidified this particular chain of intellectual influence. A second major factor would appear to lie in the essence of Parsons' work. Whereas Merton spelled out an analytic paradigm which could be applied to almost any theoretical position (Merton actually provides an extended demonstration of how his paradigm for functional analysis can be used to reveal a number of Marxian insights),

Parsons was constructing an extremely conservative explanation for the character of societies. Parsons provided an explanation for the inevitability of elite domination in any society, even a society such as the United States which was founded on the principles of participatory (although limited) democracy. Given the reformist philosophy of such a central figure in early mass communiation research as Lazarsfeld, given the growing contribution of journalism research to the pool of mass communication study (journalism with its implicit adherence to somewhat romantic notions of participatory or at least representative democracy), it is not entirely surprising that Merton's perspective on functionalism was the more widely adopted.

The functional model, derived from Merton and articulated by Melvin DeFleur and Sandra Ball-Rokeach, begins with the fundamental postulate that as "informal relationships characteristic of more traditional non-industrial societies come into decline, unfulfilled needs for information rise accordingly (3)." Consequently, it follows that people become dependent on mass communication channels when informal channels bringing information to their immediate groups begin to be disrupted. In non-industrial societies, the market place, neighborhoods, wandering performers and merchants serve as social and communicaton networks for gossip, news, and cultural information. The trends noted earlier by mass society theorists, that as a society industrializes and becomes larger, it becomes more specialized and more complex, operate to inhibit informal communication. Thus, in both developing and developed nations, mass communication comes to serve a correlation as well as a gatekeeping funtion in society--selectively keeping individuals in touch with the society as a whole. This perspective views the mass media as subsystems that cut across a society's economic, political, social and military subsystems and that serve certain functions for these other sub-

systems and for the social systems as a whole (8, 16, 23). Given this central role, to fully understand the importance of mass communication it is necessary, as DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach forcefully argue, to map the more significant connections that exist in the society between the mass media systems and other societal systems. Once this map of institutional interconnections is drawn, it is possible to identify the nature and consequences of the linkage between individuals and groups and the components of the mass media mix. The conceptual theme of such an analysis is functional interdependence between media and institutions and between institutions and individuals. DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach's effort to construct such a model is briefly presented below.

The media serve as a link between the economic system and individuals. In the US, the economic system depends on the communication resources the media controls in a number of ways. First, the economic system requires the establishment and maintenance of values compatible with capitalistic enterprise. These include fostering a continuing belief in the importance of consumption as a way of life and support for the belief that corporate competition exists and is desirable. Second, the economic system requires that mass media provide connections between producer and consumer, informing consumers about products that are available and stimulating consumer demand for these products. Finally, it is important to the economic system that the media help moderate conflicts which would threaten the market-place. These include internal conflicts such as disputes between labor and management and external conflicts which might arise between corporations, or corporations and regulatory agencies.

Conversely, the economic system would be seriously threatened if the mass media suddenly started attacking the foundations of capitalism, or refused to carry advertising or no longer helped corporations cultivate public support for their positions when in conflict with federal agencies, environmentalists, tax authorities, etc.

Although the media appear powerful in this respect, it is a power that has seldom been exercised and if it has, not for very long. The reason is that the American mass media in their current form are heavily dependent on the economic system for their own survival. The media's survival requires profits from industry can provide which help the media to operate more efficiently and consequently more profitably, and access to banking and finance services in order to underwrite expansion. These needs remind us that American mass media are, due to the nature of their organization and their financial bases, business enterprises and not public utilities.

In the US, the interdependency between the economic system and individuals is typically American. In other countries, one would expect the nature of the interdependency to vary with the culture, but there would exist to some degree a media link of a particular kind between the economic system and the citizens in developing and developed countries.

The media also serve as a link between the political system and individuals. The American political system's dependency on the media also takes several forms. It requires effective socialization of succeeding generations to contemporary political values and norms as well as continual reinforcement of those values in the adult population. The media are also required to help maintain social order and promote social integration through shaping public opinion. The role of the mass media as a molder of public opinion is recognized and accepted during times of national crises such as war, assassinations, and natural disasters. Its continuing performance of this role during more routine periods of societal business has received less attention. The political system also requires that the media serve to help mobilize citizens to carry out essential activities such as voting and waging war and to help contain and moderate

conflict within the political system and between the political system and between the political system and other social systems.

In order for the media to realize their economic goals of profit, technological development and expansion, and in order to perform the tasks the political system requires of it, the political system must in turn provide: certain specific governmental protections such as the First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and licensing regulation; access to formal and informal information resources needed for news coverage; and revenue that comes from government advertising. It should be obvious that often there will be conflicts of interest between the media's constitutional charge to be the people's watchdog on government, the media's capitalistic goals, and the self-protective instincts of whatever political party is currently in power.

Again, the media link between the political system and individuals is culture bound. The nature and degree of linkage varies across cultures; however, in some degree there is media linkage between the political system and the citizens of developing and developed countries.

Lastly, the media serve as a link between the social and military systems and individuals. In the US, several social systems such as the family, religion, and education as well as the military system are to some extent interdependent with the media. The family depends on the media for value clarification, leisure-- recreation, and assistance in child rearing. In return, the media depends on the family members for an audience of potential consumers of advertising. In addition, the US military is heavily dependent on the media for supportive press coverage, conflict management, mobilization, and national security. From the military, the media only require access to information. So important are the communication needs of the military, in the eyes of government, that the military has effectively been given its own elaborate public relations and adver-

tising capability by the government, so that the military system can feed and manipulate the information available to the mass media. Given this capability, the military system is less likely to provide the media with what they need to receive, but more with what the military needs to communicate.

While Americans experience a culture bound media linkage between their political system and individuals, other countries, each in its own cultural tradition, also manifest interdependent relations among the media, its social and military systems and its citizens. While the functions are basically the same and the interdependencies similar in many respects the details of the conceptual scheme vary across cultures.

DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach view their model as a direct reaction to the narrow hypodermic needle model, a view we later suggest is somewhat misleading. The model is also intended as a reaction to the characterization of mass communication research as "a potpouri, a borrowing area, lacking in unifying theory, a collection of suburbs in search of a city (17)." It is an attempt to address these concerns through the construction of a unique theory that includes effects of mass communication on individuals and society. Some media scholars would argue that this is a hopeles and misdirected effort (20). No other field in the social sciences demands of itself one all encompassing theory which can serve as umbrella for organizing past research and guiding new research. However, the history of mass communication as a field of study which has been a borrower of theory from other recognized fields has developed a case of self-consciousness. DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach's functional model is an ambitious effort, but not a misdirected one. The model does not purport to be a final general theoretical statement. Rather its purpose is to provide a more abstract context or perspective for viewing current research. This type of effort is necessary in any field that hopes to develop a coherent programatic approach to the study of mass communication.

DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach draw two primary conclusions from their discussion of institutional interdependence. The first is that the media occupy a central role in society justifying a general theory of mass communication as opposed to a theory of society within which the mass media occupy a position of less importance. The nature of this conclusion is significant as McQuail (14) notes, "If the media are more acted upon than acting, it has profound implications for the kinds of questions one asks." The second conclusion is that the dependencies that individuals can have on the media are largely a result of the nature of the interdependencies between the media and other institutions. In other words, they argue, individuals encounter the media as an ongoing system interacting with other systems. Consequently, these determine the nature and shape of what messages will and will not be disseminated. This process is beyond the control of the individual.

At this point DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach reach a significant theoretical juncture, not unlike the crossroad early communication theorists confronted in defining the shape mass communication research should assume. While DeFleur Ball-Rokeach acknowledge that ultimately whatever influence the media have on individuals in the society will have implications for the structure of social institutions, this is not a primary focus of their model. Like the many researchers who have gone before them, they do not propose a serious study of how institutional interconnections come to shape the form and content of media messages (answering the question, is the media acted on and if so, how?). Thus, they overlook the hypothesis-generating value of their perspective. In essence they suggest that the forces exist, but we must accept them and study the effects of mass communication within the boundaries they create. In keeping with their purpose of directing attention to potentially powerful effects of the media,

DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach review a number of possible cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects that can be largely regarded as due to the "persistent, sometimes intense, audience dependencies on media system information resources (3)." Mass media messages, therefore, continue to be regarded as a causal force, acting rather than as outcomes, being acted on. To some degree their concept of media dependency is simply another intervening variable in the psychological influence process making the impact of the mass media more or less likely.

Contemporary European scholars in their quest for understanding the effects of social forces recommend a structural model of the social control of mass media. The content, shape, and form of the mass media are to be viewed as the dependent variables in the European analysis, that is, as process being acted on, rather than as acting. Golding and Murdock (6,15) recognize the importance of studying media impact but believe that the focus on media effects has distracted research from a more fundamental role the media play in society. Their perspective focuses on questions for mass media research that include how controls are exercised, where they occur, and what the consequences of these controls are for the overall societal system as well as for the economic, political, social, and military subsystems (4). The Lasswelian formula is revised to read, "Whom owns and controls which channels of communication to say what to whom, why, and with what effects (21)." They identify three major starting points for their approach. The first is the "recognition that social relations within and between modern societies are radically, though variably, inequalitarian." The European focus, then is on "the relations between the unequal distribution of control over systems of communication and wider pattern of inequality in the distribution of wealth and power (6)." Feedback between the audience and the communicator in most modern communication systems is virtually non-existent.

In addition, access to the media, who is allowed to speak into the mass media microphone, is severely limited. These two characteristics of contemporary mass communication which most media effects researchers have taken for granted for over fifty years are main points of concern in the European approach. Attention is focused on the distribution of economic wealth and political power within society and between societies.

The second starting point for Golding and Murdock is based on the assumption that inequitable class structures are not self-sustaining. Effort must be taken to maintain them. Their second main concern, therefore, is "with the processes of legitimation through which the prevailing structures of advantage and inequality are presented as natural and inevitable (6)." Communication as well as educational systems become important fields for investigation.

The third area of concern is an extension of the second. Given that the processes for incorporating the disadvantages into society and for the legitimation of the existing order do not always progress in a smooth manner, how do communication systems and other agencies respond to challenges to the existing social order?

The European perspective begins with the study of media control and the media's relationship to the economic and political aspects of society. Golding and Murdock undertake a review of ownership trends of mass communication in Britain which parallel developments in the United States. The conclusions they arrive at appear equally valid for most advanced capitalistic economies. Briefly, they identify two major shifts in communication industry ownership. The first is a long-term trend toward concentration of media ownership. In Britain and in the United States more and more media operations are owned by fewer and fewer

large corporations. This trend is evidenced in the newspaper, television, motion picture, radio, and book publishing industries. For instance, 63% of all daily newspapers, 58% of all television stations and at least 31% of all radio stations in the United States were group owned in 1979. These group owned newspapers accounted for 72% of all daily newspaper circulation. In 1975, the television holdings of one corporation, CBS, were estimated to be capable of reaching 22% of the total television audience.

The second trend, according to Golding and Murdock, is toward the acquisition by large companies and corporations of mass media properties and a variety of media operations. For instance, in 1978 large conglomerates such as General Electric, Westinghouse and RCA all have substantial broadcast holdings. General Electric owns six AM radio stations, two FM radio stations, and three VHF television stations. Westinghouse owns seven AM radio stations, two FM stations, and five VHF television stations. RCA owns four FM stations, four AM stations, and five VHF television stations. An example of cross-media ownership is the newspapers' ownership of almost 30% of all television stations in the United States.

These trends pose a serious challenge to the American pluralistic perspective that society is largely composed of competing, independent institutions that operate as checks and balances on one another. In addition, media organizations purchased by large conglomerates are quite likely to be treated simply as new additions to a business portfolio rather than as unique institutions carrying significant responsibility for the maintenance of democratic values. More to the point of the European perspective, is that these ownership trends represent the growing potential for direct as well as indirect control by a class elite over the production and distribution of ideas of their age. Whether or not this potential for control is realized becomes a critical and complex empirical question.

The debate over whether corporate ownership translates into class power is significant in that the answer has a profound impact on thinking about societal structure. Golding and Murdock's analysis of this issue is particularly enlightening. If ownership is divorced from control, the trend toward corporate concentration becomes less ominous. The argument that control is becoming increasingly separated from ownership is straightforward. As corporations grow larger and continue to require additional resources to finance expansion, ownership is increasingly transfered to stockholders with relatively small holdings thereby dispersing the possibility of effective concentrated control. In addition, as the founders of the major corporations relinquish control, the responsibility for management falls increasingly on the shoulders of professionals. Consequently, the argument goes, corporations are guided by administrators whose primary goal is the efficient operation of the company as opposed to the exercise of political power. As Murdock and Golding point out, the question of separation is not so clear cut. First, the era of the owner-operator of major corporations is not entirely over. This is particularly true in the communications industries as illustrated by the Gannett and Thompson newspaper chains. These two corporations own almost one hundred and fifty daily newspapers in the United States. In each company a single family exercises a dominant role in the corporate decision-making.

Second, although corporations are selling shares to raise funds and apparently dispersing ownership, the last twenty years has seen a significant increase in the number of financial institutions and other industrial coporations buying these shares. As these large corporations acquire these holdings, the concentration of potential for control increases, not decreases, as indicated by a quick glance at the nembers of the board of directors for ABC in 1980. The members include executives from IBM, the Allied Chemical Corporation, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and United Merchants and Manufacturers Incorporated.

In keeping with their perspective that emphasizes social control of mass media, Murdock and Golding identify two general consequences for the form and content of the mass media due to the economic forces. First, the form and content of the media tend to narrow as market forces eliminate all but the commercially successful. Generally, fewer and fewer voices survive in each media sector as concentration advances. Second, as this evolutionary process systematically eliminates those voices without the necessary resources or economic power, the voices best able to survive the economic competition are those least likely to criticize the present distribution of wealth and power. Conversely, the voices who cannot draw upon the necessary resources for communicating with mass audiences are those most likely to express opposition to the prevailing distribution of economic wealth and political power (5). Not only may the powerless be unaware of the manipulation, but the powerful, through the security of their positions also may become oblivious to the mechanisms of domination (12). Therefore, the processes by which the class-elite comes to exercise its power over the media, and the subsequent influence process of the media on the general public are nearly invisible. Interestingly enough, the trend toward a marketplace logic for determining access to the media is rapidly becoming the standard philosophy of governmental regulatory agencies such as the Federal Communications Commission. One need only consider the arguments advanced by that agency for the deregulation of radio for example. Unfortunately, this is a skewed definition of market that is being applied (21A).

Many processes, however, remain invisible, embedded, for instance, in the nature of the professional role of the reporter. Presumably, as professionals, reporters are expected to report events objectively, honestly, truthfully, and ethically. There is empirical evidence, however, that the reporting of news is

under the influence of elite class sources. This influence exists in at least two forms. First, reporters are under the control of editors and other media managers who tend to have social status on a par with lawyers and doctors, while the reporters' social status is more in line with other nonmanagerial service types (4). Second, there is frequently a significant status difference between reporters and sources. "The reporter seeking status with a source community (scientists, military, politicians, medical doctors, educators, social elites, etc.) may subject himself to a considerable amount of control by that source system as a result (4)."

Golding and Murdock suggest that, to the extent they or others set their primary concern with mass communication research as the analysis of the forces that shape the form and content of the mass media, to the extent that they see these primary forces as economic, political, and social in nature, and to the extent that their investigation is ultimately concerned with the distribution of power and rewards in society, they are espousing a Marxian view of social process.

Most Marxist analyses derive their initial justification for examining the mass media from The German Ideology (13) written jointly by Marx with Engels. Golding and Murdock interpret this work as setting forth at least three essential propositions. The first is that control over the production and distribution of ideas is concentrated in the hands of a class-elite who own the means of production. The second is that this ownership provides the elite with continuing attention from the media for their views and accounts of the world and this attention, in turn, tends to make their thinking and opinions the dominant view of the society. The third proposition is that this ideological domination by the class-elite is crucial in maintaining class inequalities.

In respect to communication research, it is somewhat disappointing to find that most Marxist analyses have pursued a fairly limited research focus. Marx-

ists, like adherents of the traditional mass media effects model, generally assume a number of important propositions. A key point of focus for Marxist analysis has been the relationship between the economic base of the society and what has been called the cultural superstructure which consists of any and all forms of intellectual productions such as books, films, plays, fashion, television, etc. Marxist scholars have had a tendency to examine these cultural artifacts for manifestations of the dominant ideology of the class-elite. If examples of such ideology were found, they immediately assumed that their appearance was entirely due to the economic "half-nelson" the capitalists had on the society. This assumption is as naive as the assumption of mass media effects embodied in the hypodermic needle model of mass media effects. In one case, the effects of the media are assumed; in the other, the causes of the media content are assumed. Golding and Murdock argue that there must be "a concrete analysis of economic relations and ways in which they structure both the processes and results of cultural production" instead of starting by "analyzing the form and content of cultural artifacts and then working backward to describe their economic base (15)." In terms of the mass media this means a structural analysis must begin with the study of media ownership and its relationship to the economic, political, and social aspects of a society. Such an approach would enable researchers to make predictions that could be verified by empirical data.

In calling for an economic analysis of the mass media, Murdock and Golding are wary of falling into the tautological trap of previous Marxist critiques of mass communication. They recognize that documenting economic control of the mass media by a class-elite and pointing to examples of capitalist values in the mass media is not sufficient to demonstrate a causal link between the two phenomena. Work, they argue, must be explicitly addressed to uncovering the process by which such a translation occurs, and they offer guidelines for how this task might be accomplished.

The relationship between economic control and cultural hegemony can be examined at two levels. Cultural hegemony as defined here to refer to the extent to which the values of a class-elite have come to operate as the dominant values of the society. The first is concerned with how situational forces, in particular, market forces influence what resources are available for media production and creative enterprise. In other words, the relationship between economic control and hegemony might be found, in part, in how the profit motive sets economic and creative limits on the kinds of media productions that can be executed. The relationship can also be examined from a normative level. That is, in what ways are dominant cultural values translated into occupational values.

The European view points to other interesting areas of research. In addition to class conflict, one might study the other many points of potential conflict within the media and between the media and the political, eonomic, social, and military institutions. For instance, the American media are primarily competitive enterprises devoted to making profits; yet at the same time, they adhere to a sense of social responsibility to a democratic form of government which requires then to inform citizens and provide a diversity of opinions on important topics of the day--a responsibility which may conflict with securing an advantageous financial position. Or, one might apply a conflict model of analysis to the adversial relationship between a government or military purporting to protect national security and the media trying to protect the interests of the public. Consequently, the model could be valuably applied to many mass media issues.

It is significant that the European model creates in communication researchers an uneasy feeling about the nature of the assumptions, recognized and unrecognized, which underpin and guide much American research. It beckons us to reexamine the philosophical roots of our work. It is also notable in that it provides an organizing framework for future research.

The European approach also has its weaknesses. One of them is that it demands a unidimensional focus on the interplay of primarily economic forces in influencing media production. Although a strong case is made for the primacy of economic influences, it is both a narrow view and a debatable proposition. Another weakness, or perhaps it would be better labeled a challenge, is that many of the questions the approach raises will be extremely difficult to answer. Murdock and Golding might argue that the difficulty is an index of the degree of their importance.

While the American and European models differ in important respects, it may be possible to integrate them into a more comprehensive view. The American model which emphasizes a functional approach to the study of mass media rests on the following assumptions regarding the organization of society (3):

1. "A society can best be thought of as a system of interrelated parts; it is an organization of interconnected, repetitive, and patterned activities.

2. "Such a society naturally tends toward a state of dynamic equilibrium; if disharmony occurs, forces will arise tending to restore stability.

3. "All of the repetitive activities in a society make some contribution toward its state of equilibrium; in other words, all persisting forms of patterned interaction play a part in maintaining the stability of the system.

4. "At least some of the patterned and repetitive actions in a society are indispensible to its continued existence; that is, there are functional prerequisites that fill critical needs of the system without which it would not survive.

Given that American functionalists see society as having achieved a state of equilibrium there is a tendency to implicitly assume that major inequalities within the society have been eliminated (6). This perspective also tends to view the social structure as a series of parallel institutions maintaining this equilibrium. The system may require minor adjustments when occasional social stress is experienced, but in general, the system is seen as working smoothly. Conse-

quently sociologists adopting this perspective have devoted a considerable amount of research to examining the stabilizing relationships between institutions. The process of socialization, the transmission of values from one generation to another, became their dominant concern. Communication researchers, adopting the functionalist perspective, have come to see the socialization process as a key mass communication role. While related, the idea of the mass media as socializing agents is a very different perspective on how society works from the idea of mass media as legitimizing agents of existing structure. Essentially American, the first perspective embodies a rather positive, benign role to the mass media. Essentially European, the second calls attention to the distribution of power in the society.

The European model assumes that conflict rather than stability best represents the essence of social process. The postulates of the social conflict model can be summarized as follows (3):

1. "A society can best be thought of as consisting of categories and groups of people whose interests differ sharply from one another.

2. "All these components of society attempt to pursue their own interests in competition with others or to preserve their interests by resisting competitive efforts of others.

3. "A society so organized constantly experiences conflict as its components try to attain new gains or to preserve their interests; conflict, in other words, is ubiquitous.

4. "Out of the dialectic process of competing and conflicting interests comes an ongoing process of change; societies are not in a state of equilibrium but are ever changing.

In spite of the differences between the American and European models, an integrated view of mass communication is tempting. The integrated perspective would consist of three stages. The first stage consists of a mix of institutional

and individual actions that make up the sociocultural (stabilizing and conflict/change) producing forces. The second stage consists of mass media and telecommunications services that are both acted upon by the sociocultural forces in the first stage and along with other mass institutions (i.e, mass education) act upon the elements of the next stage. The third stage consists of a mix of economic wealth, political power, religious belief, social arrangements, and interpersonal relationships that make up a particular societal structure.

This integrated model based on the American and European perspectives of mass communication requires a great deal of refinement. One of the problems is how to integrate an equilibrium based American model with a conflict based European model. At least two possibilities exist. The first consists of the formulation of a comprehensive view based on the premise that there are incompatible sociocultural forces operating within any society, one set of forces which serve to create and maintain structural stability and equilibrium and another set of forces that serve to create and maintain conflict and change. Although these forces are in tension in developed countries, they are perhaps more obvious in the developing nations as they move from an agrarian society to an industrialized status. As informal relationships characteristic of more agrarian societies decline, traditional needs for information become increasingly unfulfilled. Change produces conflict involving not only challenges to previously established institutions but also to existing social arrangements. Meanwhile, mass media grows into greater diversification in information-delivery systems and services that facilitates reconstruction and restores stability. Therefore, the media become linked to a larger society in systematic ways; that is, as a country develops, individuals, societal systems, and the mass media become increasingly interdependent.

While American scholars like DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach have built a powerful case for studying the nature of equilibrium and conflict/change forces operating

on the media (as part of a socialization process), they choose to accept these forces as given and concentrate instead on the cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects of mass communication within the boundaries set by the sociocultural forces. Thus, the European model complements the American model by including some of the forces that exercise influence over the media and are legitimized or converted to stabilizing forces by the mass media.

A second method of integration of American and European perspective is essentially sequential in nature. Both start with the mass media. Viewed as basically a hypothesis-generating tool, the American model works backward to understand the forces that shape the form and content of the media. Viewed more as a hypothesis-testing tool, the European model looks forward to the potential impact that the media might have. Again, each complements the other's work and sketches out the form that such research should take. When DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach discuss the institutional interrelationship between the media and the societal system, they are outlining the territory that Golding and Murdock take it upon themselves to carefully explore. When Murdock and Golding discuss the consequences of control for the promotion of cultural hegemony, they are, in essence, realizing the importance of research into the sociocultural construction of reality that DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach review. When DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach indicate the need for more research into the types of values that are portrayed in the media, Murdock and Golding are providing the directions as to what these values might look like and how they should be studied.

Both approaches demand a social theoretical context within which mass communication research can be located and a philosophical orientation as to the form that research should take. To the extent that an integrated perspective of mass communication can incorporate notions of systemic needs, interdependency, and cooperation, moments of dynamic equilibrium, and the political, economic,

and social aspects of a society, on the one hand and on the other, notions of dominance and competition, processes of change, and areas of political/economic/social differences and conflicts, fruitful areas of research emerge, as interesting hypotheses are generated, and their confirmation or disconfirmation are undertaken.

An integration of the American and European models has implications for the study of mass communication. First, the mass media are viewed as essential elements of a society they serve, rather than as unique systems independent of the societal system. This view argues against the position that the media operate as an independent "fourth estate."

Second, the primary task of the research requires more than the examination of the meaning of media messages, and includes the exploration of social processes that influence one another and the mass media. The move here is away from solely psychological processes involved in the audience's perception and interpretation of media messages (the receiving of messages) to theories of social forces, social structure, and social functions. The integrated view expands the original paradigm of mass communication research to include the dynamics, systems, and processes of communication along with message impact concerning audiences and effects. Technical problems of noise, audience selective perceptions, and choice of channels remain as important considerations within broader theories of social change that identify the role of mass media and telecommunications.

Finally, an integrated view has implications for communication policy. With its simplistic view of the omnipotent media and uncritical audience, the diffusionist approach to social change and modernization which is based on the hypodermic needle model of mass communication is especially accompanied with stagnation and frustration in Third World developing nations (18). The integrated model

which includes the social forces, institutions, and a broad sociocultural view permits consideration of cultural differences, inclusion of indigenous communication systems, and broadens the scope for inquiry and policy formulation. For example, before accelerating the use of telecommunications, sophisticated mass media systems, and other information technology to developing countries, a more encompassign sociocultural view would study the supply of educators, managers, and persons trained in broadcasting and communications, that is the level of social organization necessary for sustained development.

In conclusion, an integrated perspective based on the American and European models is significant in that it goes far beyond traditional theorizing about the role of mass communication in society. It is located in a broader social context which recognizes that the nature of mass media content is heavily determined by the intricate web of interdependencies that have been spun between the mass media, political/economic forces, and other societal institutions. An integrated perspective of the potential effects of mass communication pushes the meaning of effect beyond mere attitude change to encompass the richness and subtlety with which the media may influence our lives and helps to restore the view of the mass media as important sources of influence in our lives and in society.

REFERENCES

1. Chaffee, Stenven H. "The Interpersonal Context of Mass Communication." In F. Gerald Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor (Eds.) Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972.

2. Comstock, G. and G. Lindsey. Television and Human Behavior. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1975.

3. DeFleur, Melvin L. and Sandra Ball-Rokeach. Theories of Mass Communication. New York: Longman, 1982.

4. Donohue, George A., Phillip J. Tichenor, and Clarice N. Olien, "Gatekeeping: Mass Media Systems and Information Control." In F. Gerald Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor (Eds.) Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research, vol. 1. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972.

5. Donohue, George A., Phillip J. Tichenor, and Clarice N. Olien, "Media Evaluations and Groups Power," paper presented at the Conference on the Role of News Media in International Conflict, East-West Communication Institute; East-West Center, Honolulu, HI, 1981.

6. Golding, P. and G. Murdock. "Theories of Communication and Theories of Society." Communication Research, 3, 1978, pp. 339-356.

7. Hamelink, Cees J. "Some Assumptions Underlying the Demand for More Research." In International Association for Mass Communication Research, New Structures of International Communication? The Role of Research. Leicester, England: Adams Bros & Shardlow, 1982.

8. Katz, D. and R.L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1966.

9. Katz, E. and P. Lazarsfeld. Personal Influence. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954.

10. Klapper, Joseph. The Effects of Mass Communication. New York: Free Press, 1960.

11. Lasswell, H.D. "Propaganda." In The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 12. New York: Macmillan, 1934.

12. Lukes, Steven. Power: A Radical View. London: Macmillan, 1974.

13. Marx, K. and F. Engels. The German Ideology. R. Pascal (Trans.). London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1938.

14. McQuail, D. "Introduction." In D. McQuail (Ed.) Sociology of Mass Communication. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

15. Murdock, G. and P. Golding. "Capitalism, Communication and Class Relations." In J. Curran, M. Gurevitch, and J. Woolacott (Eds.) Mass Communication and Society. London: Sage, 1977.

16. Parsons, T. "A Paradigm for the Analysis of Social Systems and Change." In N.S. Demerath and R.A. Peterson (Eds.) System, Change and Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1967.

17. Roberts, D.F. and C.M. Bachen. "Mass Communication Effects." Annual Review of Psychology, 32, 1981, pp. 307-356.

18. Rogers, Everett M. "The Rise and Fall of the Dominant Paradigm." Journal of Communication, 28, 1978, pp. 64-69.

19. Rogers, Everett M. "Future Directions in Communication Research: Toward Network Analysis and Convergence Models." In International Association for Mass Communication Research, New Structures of International Communication? The Role of Research. Leicester, England: Adams Bros & Shardlow, 1982.

20. Schramm, Wilbur. "Comments on Berelson," Public Opinion Quarterly, 23, 1959, pp. 8-9.

21. Tehranian, Majid. "Development Theory and Communications Policy: The Changing Paradigms." In Melvin J. Voigt and Gerhard J. Hanneman (Eds.) Progress in Communication Sciences. Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX, 1979.

21A. Smythe, Dallas, W. "Radio: Deregulation and the Relation of the Private and Public Sectors." Journal of Communication, 32, 1982, pp. 192-201.

22. Tehranian, Majid. "The Curse of Modernity: The Dialects of Modernization and Communication," International Social Science Journal, 32, 1980, pp. 247-63.

23. Westley, B.H. and M.S. MacLean, Jr. "A Conceptual Model for Communication Research." Journalism Quarterly, 34, 1957, pp. 31-38.